IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE SIDE

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.3512 OF 2006

The State of Maharashtra .. Applicant.

V/s.

Shri.Rajan Hindurao Shinde .. Respondent.

Shri.S.S.Pednekar, A.P.P. for the State.

Shri.A.P.Mundargi with Shri.Amol Patankar for the respondent.

CORAM : S.C.DHARMADHIKARI, J.

DATE : 8TH DECEMBER, 2006

P.C.:

. The Govt. of Maharashtra applied for cancellation of order of Anticipatory Bail Application dated 16th June, 2006 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Palghar in Cri.Bail Appln. No.239 of 2006.

. The principal contention of the learned A.P.P. appearing on behalf of the State is that the Court below

has not specified the time/duration for which the order of Anticipatory Bail shall remain in force and further has not imposed any condition for attendance, save and except stating that the accused would be available for interrogation.

. An affidavit-in-reply is filed by the original accused-respondent before me and in Para 4 thereof it is pointed out that after the order of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, he has attended the concerned police station. Although, he resides at Kolhapur, Mr. Mundargi upon instructions states that the accused-respondent would make himself available as and when summoned and would extend full co-operation in the investigation, if any.

. Both sides did not dispute that now chargesheet is filed. It is not necessary to scrutinize the legality of the order, save and except observing that even though the order is passed on application requesting pre-Arrest bail, in the peculiar facts of this case, it will operate till the conclusion of the trial provided the applicant abides by the conditions imposed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge so also attend as and when summoned. The accused-respondent to extend all co-operation in

expeditious disposal of the sessions case.

. The application is dismissed with the above clarification.

(S.C.Dharmadhikari, J.)